

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

After the foregoing Amendment, claims 1-11, and 16-18 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1-11, 16 and 17 are amended.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 1-2 and 8-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0134636 to Sundar et al. (hereinafter Sundar) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,061,917 to Camille et al. (hereinafter Camille).

Claim 1 recites establishing a bidirectional IP link to allow service operation parameter negotiation prior to network selection and receiving requested service level system information over the bidirectional IP link. Sundar does not teach that service level system information is received at a WTRU over a bidirectional IP link. Sundar discloses an IP link 504 that connects a WLAN and a WWAN. The IP links of Sundar cannot be used to allow service operation parameter negotiation at the WTRU because the IP links of Sundar are between the APs of a WLAN or base station of a WWAN and the mobile switching center (MSC). Sundar carries voice traffic, along with associated signaling and control information over these IP links from the enterprise to the IP interface of a mobile switching center (MSC) 302 (paragraph [0056]). The MSC communicates through a base station controller, to

one or more antenna-based Base Transceiver Systems that communicate with the remote units (paragraph [0010]). Sundar teaches that a mobile station may receive information regarding the detection or discovery of potential SSID's that are stored in an a priori provisioned list of valid SSIDs and SSID ranges available to the mobile station, but Sundar does not teach or disclose a bidirectional IP link wherein requested service level information is received by a WTRU.

Camille discloses the negotiation of a service level agreement based on a pre-agreed service level specification (col. 2, ln. 42) between the network access server (col. 2, ln 53) and a personal computer (col. 2, ln. 39) connected via a dial-in connection over a point-to-point protocol (col. 3, ln. 59-60). Camille's Data Transmitting Network Element (DTE, i.e. the personal computer), requests a specific service level specification through an Internet Protocol Control Protocol Request. This is not the same as a bidirectional IP link established at a WTRU, as Camille does not relate to wireless communications. Accordingly, Camille fails to cure the deficiencies of Sundar.

There is nothing in Sundar and Camille taken alone or in combination that explains how a person skilled in the art would derive a bidirectional IP link established at the WTRU for requesting service level system information and receiving the requested service level system information as claimed. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Sundar and Camille.

Claims 2 and 8-11 ultimately depend from allowable claim 1 and are therefore patentable over Sundar and Camille for the same reasons provided above regarding claim 1.

Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Sundar, Camille and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,055,107 to Rappaport et al. (hereinafter Rappaport). Claims 3 and 4 ultimately depend from allowable claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons presented above with regard to claim 1.

Claims 5-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Sundar, Camille, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,072,663 to Ramos et al. (hereinafter Ramos). Claims 5-7 ultimately depend from allowable claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons presented above with regard to claim 1.

Claims 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Ramos in view of Camille.

Claim 16 recites, receiving service level system information from the network at a WTRU and selecting a PSA based on the received service level system information and a PSA known at the WTRU. Ramos does not disclose or teach the receiving of service level system information.

Camille discloses the negotiation of a service level agreement based on a pre-agreed service level specification (col. 2, ln. 42) between the network access server

(col. 2, ln 53) and a personal computer (col. 2, ln. 39) connected via a dial-in connection over a point-to-point protocol (col. 3, ln. 59-60). Camille's Data Transmitting Network Element (DTE, i.e. the personal computer), requests a specific service level specification through an Internet Protocol Control Protocol Request. Therefore, Camille does not disclose or teach receiving service level system information from the network at a WTRU as Camille does not deal with wireless communications. For the reasons given above, claim 16 is patentable over Ramos in view of Camille.

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Camille in view of Sundar. Claim 18 recites a WTRU comprising a receiver for receiving service level system information over a bidirectional IP link at the WTRU. Claim 18 is patentable over Camille and Sundar for the same reason presented above with regard to claim 1.

The withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1-11 and 16-18 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

If the Examiner believes that any additional minor formal matters need to be addressed in order to place this application in condition for allowance, or that a telephonic interview will help to materially advance the prosecution of this

Applicant: Menon et al.
Application No.: 10/612,156

application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone at the Examiner's convenience.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Menon et al.

By /John D. Brink, Jr./
John D. Brink Jr.
Registration No. 60,288

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.
United Plaza, Suite 1600
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-6400
Facsimile: (215) 568-6499

JDB/ALV/jmn